



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,215	03/09/2004	Scott T. Moore	10000-353	2716
7590 04/14/2008 Lawrence G. Almeda, Esq. BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610				
			EXAMINER LANG, AMY T	
			ART UNIT 3731	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,215

Applicant(s)

MOORE ET AL.

Examiner

AMY T. LANG

Art Unit

3731

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-28 and 35 are pending, claims 29-34 are cancelled, and claims 1, 11, 23, and 35 are currently amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14-28, and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore (US 2001/0049547 A1).

With regard to **claims 1 and 11**, Moore discloses a pusher assembly (see entire document) comprising a catheter (11), a first tubular portion (13) and a second tubular portion (12). The first tubular portion is comprised of non-rigid polymer ([0014]). The second tubular portion extends distally from the first tubular portion and, as shown in Figure 1, comprises a flexible section and a stent carrying section ([0014]). A pusher member (14) is located proximal of the stent on the second tubular portion and urges the stent from the catheter ([0015]). The pusher member comprises a polymer and has a proximal taper ([0015]; Figure 1). Furthermore, the pusher member is inherently adapted to be positioned at an acute bend in a patient's body and absorb preload pressure from the stent. As shown in Figure 1, the outside diameter of the first tubular portion (13) is less than the inside diameter of the catheter (11).

With regard to **claims 2 and 12**, the flexible section of the second tubular portion has a preselected length depending on the application ([0016]). The region comprising the greatest likelihood of a kink intrinsically corresponds to the region of greatest flexibility.

With regard to **claims 6 and 18**, as shown in Figures 1 and 5, the second tubular member has a smaller outer diameter than the first tubular portion.

With regard to **claims 7-9, 19-21, and 24-26**, the second tubular portion is further disclosed as comprising a braided polyimide tubing ([0014]).

With regard to **claims 10 and 22**, the stent carrying section and the flexible section are comprised of a single continuous element ([0014]). The sent is positioned along the sent carrying section between the pusher member (14) and a tapered distal tip (16).

With regard to **claim 14**, as shown in Figure 1, the proximal end of the stent is received by the pusher member and inherently absorbs preload pressure.

With regard to **claims 15 and 23**, as shown in Figure 1, the pusher member (14) comprises a face and a proximal taper.

With regard to **claims 16 and 28**, the stent is self-expanding ([0012]).

With regard to **claim 17**, as shown in Figure 1, the pusher assembly and stent are slideably disposed in the catheter (11).

With regard to **claim 27**, the stent carrying section is distal of the flexible section and extends to the distal tip.

With regard to **claim 35**, as shown in Figure 5, the second tubular portion extends the entire length of the first tubular portion ([0016]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. **Claims 1-3 and 6-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft (US 5,702,418) in view of Wilson (US 6,425,898 B1).

With regard to **claims 1 and 11**, Ravenscroft discloses a pusher assembly of a stent delivery system (see entire document) comprising a catheter (11), a first tubular portion (15 or 16), and a second tubular portion (17). The first tubular portion comprises PEBAX or is disclosed as flexible, which clearly overlaps the instantly claimed non-rigid polymer (column 5, lines 23-26. 29-30). As shown in Figures 5, 1, and 4, the second

tubular portion comprises a distal stent carrying section and a proximal section, located proximal of the stent carrying section. The second tubular (17) is disclosed as flexible so that the proximal section clearly overlaps the instantly claimed flexible section. Furthermore, it is the examiner's position that the second tubular portion distally extends from the first tubular portion, as shown in Figure 5. Additionally, the outside diameter of the first tubular portion (15 or 16) is less than the inside diameter of the catheter (11) (Figure 5).

Ravenscroft further discloses rings (23) placed around the stent to urge the stent distally when advanced from the catheter. However, Ravenscroft does not specifically disclose a soft pusher member having a tapered proximal surface to urge the stent distally.

Wilson, as shown in Figure 5, discloses a catheter assembly comprising a distal stent carrying section. Immediately proximal to the stent carrying section is pusher member (21 and 22). Wilson teaches that the pusher member contacts the stent and helps to urge the stent out of the sheath when deployed into the patient at the target site (column 5, lines 58 through column 6, line 21). The pusher member is further disclosed as made from any material known in the art which encompasses polymer materials. As shown in Figure 5, the pusher member (21 and 22) tapers proximally and is intrinsically configured to be positioned at an acute bend in a patient's body and absorb preload pressure.

Wilson teaches that the pusher member advantageously pushes the stent during deployment while preventing the stent from proximally retracting (column 6, lines

2-6). Therefore, since Ravenscroft discloses a pusher member and Wilson discloses a specific pusher member that is advantageous, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Ravenscroft to utilize the pusher member of Wilson.

With regard to **claims 2 and 12**, Ravenscroft teaches the pusher assembly is utilized for endoscopic delivery of stent to a patient (column 1, lines 6-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for each component, specifically the flexible section, to comprise a preselected length that is proper for the designated procedure. The region comprising the greatest likelihood of a kink intrinsically corresponds to the region of greatest flexibility.

With regard to **claims 3 and 13**, the pusher member of Wilson is further disclosed as comprising a radiopaque filler (column 6, lines 19-21).

With regard to **claims 6 and 18**, as shown in Figure 5 of Ravenscroft, the second tubular portion (17) comprises a smaller outer diameter than the first tubular portion (15 or 16).

With regard to **claims 7-9, 19-21, and 24-26**, Ravenscroft does not specifically disclose the second tubular member as comprising a metal-reinforced polymer material or as Nitinol. Wilson teaches the distal end of the tubular shaft (10) comprises a polymer material reinforced with metal braided wires or Nitinol (column 5, lines 27-35). This gives the tubular member shaft the necessary flexibility and strength to navigate vessels and deploy the stent (column 5, lines 38-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the distal end of

the tubular member, the second tubular member, to comprise a polymer reinforced with metal or Nitinol, a nickel-titanium alloy

With regard to **claims 10 and 22**, as shown in Figure 5 of Ravenscroft, the stent carrying section and the flexible section are comprised of a single continuous element. The sent is positioned along the sent carrying section between the soft pusher member and a tapered distal tip (13).

With regard to **claim 14**, Ravenscroft in view of Wilson would produce a pusher assembly wherein the proximal end of the stent is received by the pusher member and intrinsically absorbs preload pressure.

With regard to **claims 15 and 23**, as shown in Figure 4 of Wilson, the pusher member (22 and 21) comprises a face, the distal portion of 22, which has a diameter equal to the preloaded stent.

With regard to **claims 16 and 28**, Ravenscroft further discloses the stent as self-expanding (column 4, lines 60-62).

With regard to **claim 17**, as shown in Figures 5, 1, and 4 of Ravenscroft, the pusher assembly and stent are slideably disposed in the catheter (11).

With regard to **claim 27**, the stent carrying section of Ravenscroft is distal of the flexible section and extends to the distal tip.

6. **Claims 3 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (US 2001/0049547 A1) in view of Wilson (US 6,425,898 B1).

Moore discloses the invention substantially as claimed but fails to teach the pusher member comprising a radiopaque filler.

Wilson also discloses a push member to urge the stent from the catheter. The pusher member comprises a radiopaque filler to aid in positioning the stent at the target site (column 6, lines 19-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the pusher member of Moore to also comprise a radiopaque filler for the advantage disclosed by Wilson.

7. **Claim 35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft (US 5,702,418) in view of Wilson (US 6,425,898 B1) and Chew (US 2004/0215331 A1).

Ravenscroft in view of Wilson discloses the invention substantially as claimed but fails to teach the second tubular member (17) as extending along the entire length of the first tubular member (15 or 16).

Chew discloses a catheter with multiple tubular members. As shown in Figure 20, an inner tubular member (336) extends the length of middle tubular member (334) which extends the length of outer tubular member (332) ([0132]). Inner tubular member forms a guidewire lumen ([0132]). Since Ravenscroft also discloses a guidewire and multiple tubular members, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the second tubular portion (equivalent to an inner tubular member) to extend the length of the first tubular portion (equivalent to a middle tubular member) and form a guidewire lumen.

8. **Claim 4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Moore (US 2001/0049547 A1) in view of Will (US 2007/0129733 A1) or the combination of Ravenscroft (US 5,702,418) in view of Wilson (US 6,425,898 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Will (US 2007/0129733 A1).

Both Moore and Ravenscroft in view of Wilson disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, neither Moore, Ravenscroft, nor Wilson specifically discloses the pusher member comprised of a low density polymer.

Will discloses a pusher member (90) that also urges the stent from the catheter (Figure 7A). The pusher member comprises polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), a low density polymer. Since Will teaches that PTFE is a common material utilized for a pusher member and both Moore and Ravenscroft in view of Wilson are open to various materials, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention for Moore or Ravenscroft in view of Wilson to utilize PTFE.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy Lang whose telephone number is (571) 272-9057. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on 571-272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3731

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

04/10/2008

/Amy T Lang/

Examiner, Art Unit 3731

/Todd E Manahan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731